

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7373 — In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Labour Court Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Delhi Road, Hissar.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 316 of 1978

SHRI BAIJ NATH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JINDAL STRIPS LTD.,  
DELHI ROAD, HISSAR.

*Present.*—Shri Tek Chand Gupta, for the workman.  
Shri V.P. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/74-78/53536, dated 28th November, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar and its workman Shri Baij Nath to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Baij Nath was justified and in Order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed Photostat copy of settlement dated 9th February, 1979 arrived at between the parties under section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As per settlement the management agreed to pay Gratuity, Bonus, Earned Leave, Wages and other Wages outstanding, if any, to the workman and the workman agreed to withdraw his claim for reinstatement on 30th April, 1979. The parties appeared before me and Shri Tek Chand Gupta, authorised representative who is General Secretary to Mazdoor Ekta Union, Hissar, also made the following statement :

“The workman has received his compensation for termination of his services and all other claim from the management. He is no longer interested in reinstatement by the management and, therefore, does not want to pursue this reference. The reference may be filed ?”

In view of the settlement and the statement of the representative of the workman I answer the award that the termination of services of Shri Baij Nath was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated the 23rd June, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana.

Endst. No. 1530, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7374 — In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Ms/ Bhinko Fiber Pvt. Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 9 of 1977

between

SHRI GAURI SHANKAR GUPTA WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHINKO  
FIBER PRIVATE LTD., BAHADURGARH.

*Present.*—Shri Rajender Singh, for the workman.  
No one, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/330-G-76/15006, dated 21st April, 1977 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Bhinko Fiber Private Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Gauri Shankar to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the Powers conferred by clause (c) of the sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

“Whether the termination of service of the workman Shri Gauri Shankar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief his he entitled ?”

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties but on the notice sent to the management report was received “Left without address, returned to Addressee.”

Notice were issued to the management for 18th June, 1977, 18th July, 1977, 17th August, 1977 and numerous other dates ultimately my predecessor ordered dated 6th October, 1977 for substituted service his order is reproduced as under :—

*Present.*—Shri Sagar Ram Gupta, for the workman.

Report of the Postal authority has been received on the registered envelope sent to the management concerned for service of the notice contained therein, that Sh. Nirmal Kumar Bose partner of the management concerned was not found at the address mentioned in the reference and seemingly supplied by the workman. The workman regrets his inability to supply any address and it is thus obvious that service of the management concerned cannot be effected. The workman under the circumstances prays that the service of notices of this reference be effected on the management concerned through publication of a notification in some paper circulated in Delhi and Bahadurgarh. The request being reasonable I direct that the service of the management of the notice of reference be effected in the aforesaid manner. The workman shall in this connection deposit a sum of Rs 60 for publication of this notice. Case to come upon on 2nd December, 1977.

Dated 6th October, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

About one year and 8 months have passed and more than 12 opportunities have been granted to the workman to comply with that order but the workman has not taken any step in compliance of the order. On 20th June, 1979 Shri Rajender Singh representative of the workman made the following statement on 20th June, 1979 :

"The workman was directed to deposit the fees for publication of the notice and to supply correct address of the respondent but he is not pursuing his case. I therefore, cannot comply with the order of the Labour Court and withdraw the demand notice. This reference may be filed."

In view of the above statement of the authorised representative of the workman I dismiss this reference and give my award that the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 21st June, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 1519, dated 26th June, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7375.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Delhi Road, Hissar.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 362 of 1978

between

SHRI FIRTU RAM WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JINDAL STRIPS LTD.,  
DELHI ROAD, HISSAR

Present.—

Shri Tek Chand, for the workman.  
Shri V. P. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/56211, dated 18th December, 1978 the Governor of Haryana the following dispute between the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar and its workman Shri Firtu Ram to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of the sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Firtu Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Shri Tek Chand Gupta Secretary, Mazdoor Ekta Union, Nagori Gate, Hissar through whom the demand was raised appeared on behalf of the workman and Shri V. P. Gupta appeared on behalf of the management stated that :

"The workman has left this place to U.P. and his whereabouts are not known. He has not left any address and even his co-workers could not supply his address and I could not contact the workman. Therefore, I cannot do anything in this case without the instructions of the workman and he may be permitted to withdraw from this case."

I, therefore, have no alternative but to dismiss this Reference in default of appearance of the workman.

Dated the 21st June, 1979

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana.

Endst. No. 1518, dated 26th June, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7376.---In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 382 of 1978

between

SHRI PHUL CHAND II WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JINDAL STRIPS  
LTD., HISSAR

Present :--

Shri Tek Chand Gupta, for the workman.  
Shri V. P. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/82-78/56399, dated 18th December, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar and its workman Shri Phul Chand II to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :--

"Whether the termination of the service of Shri Phul Chand-II was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Shri Tek Chand Gupta, Secretary, Mazdoor Ekta Union, Nagori Gate, Hissar through whom the demand was raised appeared on behalf of the workman and Shri V. P. Gupta appeared to the management stated that :

"the workman has left this place to U.P. and his whereabouts are not known. He has not left any address and even his co-workers could not supply his address and I could not contact the workman. Therefore, I cannot do any thing in this case without the instruction of the workman and he may be permitted to withdraw from this case."

It therefore, have no alternative but to dismiss this reference in default of appearance of the workman.

Dated the 21st June, 1979

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 1517, dated 26th June, 1979

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7377.---In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Tools India Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 83 of 1978

SHRI G. K. DUTTA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S TOOLS INDIA LTD.,  
BAHADURGARH, DISTRICT ROHTAK

Present :--

No one, for the workman.  
Shri M. M. Kaushal, for the Management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/PTK/539-77/25036, dated 6th June, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Tools India Private Ltd., Bahadurgarh, District Rohtak and its workman Shri G. K. Dutta to this Court for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of the sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :--

whether the termination of services of Shri G.K. Dutta was justified and in order. If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference the notices were issued to the parties and on the pleading of the parties the following issues were framed by my predecessor on 8th December, 1978 :—

- (1) Whether the workman had withdrawn his resignation ? If so, to what effect ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Shri G. K. Dutta was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
- (3) Whether the factory is closed ? If so, to what effect ?
- (4) Whether the dispute is not an industrial dispute under section 2-A of the I. D. Act, 1947 ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman on 9th January, 1979. On 9th January, 1979 the evidence of the workman was not present and the case was adjourned for 7th February, 1979. In the meanwhile an application, dated 31st January, 1979 was received in this Court from the workman withdrawing his claim. And the case was again adjourned to 7th March, 1979, as the representative of the workman wanted to verify the withdrawal application. On 7th March, 1979 the case was adjourned to 11th April, 1979 and on 11th April, 1979 one more opportunity was granted for 10th May, 1979 as in the meanwhile Shri Onkar Prasad representative of the workman had expired and Shri Harish Chand had appeared on behalf of the workman. He was directed to produce the workman on 10th May, 1979. No one appeared on behalf of the workman on 10th May, 1979 and *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman and the case fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management to be produced on 20th June, 1979. The management produced Shri M. L. Parik Director of the management as MW-1 who stated that the workman joined the management on 22nd June, 1977 and voluntarily resigned on 12th September, 1977 which was accepted by him on the same date which he produced as Exhibit MW-1. He also produced the attendance register in which from 12th September, 1977 onwards his name has been struck off from the Attendance Register and marked "resigned". He also produced voucher Exhibit M/2 for Rs. 66-67 Paise in full and final settlement of his dues. He produced letter Exhibit M/3 from the workman, dated 28th September, 1977 withdrawing his resignation letter which was replied through letter Exhibit M/4 and Exhibit M/5 is the acknowledgement of that letter. Exhibit M/6 is demand notice he produced notice Exhibit M/7 regarding closure of the Factory and notice Exhibit M/8 closure notice served on the Government and stated that the factory had been closed down and the management did not intend to run the factory. He also stated that the resignation tendered by the workman was voluntary. In view of the statement of MW-1 the documents produced by him and the withdrawal letter sent by the workman,—*vide* his application, dated 31st January, 1979. I give my issue-wise findings as under :—

**Issue No. 1 :**

The resignation was tendered by the workman on 12th September, 1977,—*vide* Exhibit M/1 and the same was accepted on the same day. Exhibit M/3 was written withdrawal of resignation letter on 28th September, 1977 when the resignation had already been accepted and became effective. This issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

**Issue No. 2 :**

The management did not terminate the services of the workman rather he himself resigned his job voluntarily. This issue, therefore, becomes redundant and is decided against the workman.

**Issue No. 3 :**

Closure notice Exhibit M/7 and Exhibit M/8 are un-ambiguous and are clear that the factory has been closed down by the management with effect from 20th September, 1978. This issue has also been decided in favour of the management.

**Issue No. 4 :**

As the workman tendered his resignation which was accepted by the management. There is no Industrial Dispute as under section 2-A of the I. D. Act. I, therefore, hold and answer the reference that the workman voluntarily resigned his job and there is no question of termination of the services by the management and the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 23rd June, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

— — — — —  
Endorsement No. 1512, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7378.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Harbhajan Printing Press, Joginder Market, Yamunanagar :—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 60 of 1979

*between*

SHRI SOM PAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARBHAJAN PRINTING  
PRESS, JOGINDER MARKET, YAMUNANAGAR

*Present :—*

Shri Som Pal alongwith Shri Surinder Kumar, his representative.

Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

**AWARD**

By order No. ID/YMN/17-79/11454, dated 12th March, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Harbhajan Printing Press, Joginder Market, Yamuna nagar and its workman Shri Som Pal to this court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of the service of Shri Som Pal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, the notices were issued to the parties. On 24th May, 1979, the workman appeared and filed an application for withdrawing the case and made the statement that :—

"He has settled his case with the management and received all his dues. He also stated that the workman withdraws his claim for reinstatement with the management and requested for filing his claim".

In view of the statement I hold and answer the reference that the termination of the service of the workman was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 21st June, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 1516, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary, to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7379.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. N. K. Engineering Works, Yamunanagar :—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 115 of 1977

*between*

SHRI VIJAY NARAIN PANDAY, WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. N. K.  
ENGINEERING WORKS, YAMUNA NAGAR

*Present :—*

Shri Balbir Singh, for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

**AWARD**

By order No. ID/Amb./181-A-77/4553, dated 19th October, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s N. K. Engineering Works, Yamunaagar and its workman Shri Vijay Narain Panday to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Vijay Narain Panday was justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by my Learned Predecessor on 29th March, 1978 :—

1. Whether the workman concerned was an employe of the management concerned at Chowkidar ?

2. Whether the retrenchment of the workman concerned made,—*vide* letter dated 12th March, 1977 was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the parties on 25th June, 1978. After some adjournments the parties settled their claim and made their statements on 25th May, 1979. The workman stated that :—

"I have settled my claim in respect of this reference in full and final settlement of all other claims against this management in consideration of the management agreeing to pay me a compensation of Rs. 600 which they have agreed to pay me by 15th June, 1979 and in anticipation of the payment I withdraw my reference and relinquish the right of reinstatement or re-employment but if the management does not pay the compensation amount by 15th June, 1979, I will have a right to recover this amount alongwith Rs. 100 more as damages under section 33-C(2) by way of an application."

Shri Subhash Chander representative of the management made the following statement that :—

"I have heard the statement of Shri Vijay Narain Panday, workman. The management has settled the case in full and final settlement for Rs. 600 which will be paid to the workman by 15th June, 1979 and on default of payment by the management the workman shall be entitled to recover this Rs. 600 alongwith Rs. 100 as damages by filing the application under section 33-C(2) of the I. D. Act."

In view of the statement of the parties I answer the reference that the workman is not entitled to reinstatement or back wages but only to the amount of compensation as per statements of the parties above.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Dated the 21st June, 1979.

Endst. No. 1515, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the I.D. Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3 Lab-79/7380.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Industrial Cables (India) Ltd., Lal Chand Nagar, Kila Zafargarh, Jind:—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 192 of 1978.

between

SHRI RAM SNEHI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. INDUSTRIAL CABLES  
(INDIA), LTD., LAL CHAND NAGAR, KILA ZAFARGARH, JIND.

Present:—No one for the workman.

Shri B.D. Gulati alongwith Shri C.M.Lal, representative of the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/KNL/42-78/33806, dated 19th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Industrial Cables (India) Ltd., Lal Chand Nagar, Kila Zafargarh, Jind and its workman Shri Ram Snehi to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of the service of Shri Ram Snehi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, the notices were issued to the parties. The parties filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by my Learned Predecessor on 20th September, 1978:—

1. Whether the workman settled his dispute fully and finally? If so, to what effect?

2. Whether the workman was employed temporarily for a specific purpose and specific period ?  
If so, when that specific purpose and period ended and to what effect ?
3. If findings on issues No. 1 and 2 are against the management whether the termination of service of the workman was justified and in order ?
4. If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management for 7th November, 1978. On 13th April, 1979, the evidence of the management was present but Shri Harish Chander who appeared on behalf of the workman obtained adjournment in the case on the ground that the original representative Shri Onkar Pd. has since died and the workman wanted adjournment. The case was adjourned for 10th May, 1979. On 10th May, 1979, no one appeared on behalf the workman and *ex-parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman and evidence of the management was recorded.

Shri B.D. Gulati, Factory Manager as MW-1 stated on oath that Shri Ram Snehi was employed as a casual worker with effect from 15th November, 1977 and exhibited appointment letter Es. M-1. He produced a copy of the standing order of the management as Ex. M-2. He stated that the job for which the workman was employed was purely of casual nature which was completed and his services were dispensed with on 3rd March, 1978. He raised a demand before Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Panipat and produced letters Ex. M-3 and M-4 stating that the above workman was employed from 11th May, 1977 to 3rd March, 1978 on a job of temporarily nature and payments tendered in full and final settlement of his account. He produced a copy of vouchers dated 30th May, 1978, Ex. M-5 through which the workman received Rs. 124.26 on account of full and final payment of his salary. He stated that no further claim of the workman was left on the management and the workman is not entitled to any further claim.

I heard his arguments and I have gone through the evidence produced before me. My issuewise findings are as under.

**Issue No. 1 :**

Ex-M-5 is true copy of voucher dated 30th May, 1978 in respect of full and final payment of Rs. 124.26 and this issue is decided in favour of the management.

**Issue No. 2 :**

The workman was employed as a casual helper on Rs. 6.54 P. per day from 15th November, 1977 and the services were dispensed with on 3rd March, 1978. His employment was purely casual of temporary nature and this issue is decided in favour of the management.

**Issue No. 3 and 4 :**

On the basis of findings of Issues No. 1 and 2 in favour of the management. I decide issue No. 3 and 4 to be redundant and answer this reference and give my award that the termination of the services of the workman was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 21st June, 1979.

**BABU RAM GOYAL,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 1514, dated 26th June, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

**BABU RAM GOYAL,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7387.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana has pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Jindal Strips Ltd., Delhi Road, Hissar :—

**BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK**

**Reference No. 12 of 1979**

*between*

**SHRI KISHORE, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. JINDAL STRIPS LTD.,  
DELHI ROAD, HISSAR**

*Present.—*

Shri Tek Chand Gupta, for the workman.  
Shri V.P. Gupta, for the management.

**AWARD**

By order No. ID/HSR/89-78/1087, dated 8th January, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar and its workman Shri Kishore to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kishore was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed photo-stat copy of settlement dated 7th February, 1979 arrived at between the parties under section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As per settlement the management agreed to pay gratuity, bonus, earned leave, wages and other wages outstanding, if any, to the workman and the workman agreed to withdraw his claim for reinstatement on 30th April, 1979. The parties appeared before me and Shri Tek Chand Gupta, authorised representative who is General Secretary to Mazdoor Ekta Union, Hissar, also made the following statement :—

"The workman has received his compensation for termination of his services and all other claim from the management. He is no longer interested in reinstatement by the management and therefore does not want to pursue this reference. The reference may be filed ?"

In view of the settlement and the statement of the representative of the workman I answer the award that the termination of services of Shri Kishore was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated 23rd June, 1979.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak

Endorsement No. 1529, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 11(112)-3Lab-79/7388.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Jindal Strips Ltd., Delhi Road, Hissar :—

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 312/78

between

SHRI LUTAI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. JINDAL STRIPS LTD.,  
DELHI ROAD, HISSAR

Present.—

Shri Tek Chand Gupta, for the workman.  
Shri V.P. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/HSR/72-78/52372, dated 23rd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Jindal Strips Ltd., Hissar and its workman Shri Lutai to this court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lutai was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed photo-stat copy of settlement dated 3rd February, 1979 arrived at between the parties under section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As per settlement the management agreed to pay gratuity, bonus, earned leave, wages and other wages outstanding, if any, to the workman and the workman agreed to withdraw his claim for reinstatement on 30th April, 1979. The parties appeared before me and Shri Tek Chand Gupta, authorised representative who is General Secretary to Mazdoor Ekta Union, Hissar, also made the following statement :—

"The workman has received his compensation for termination of his services and all other claim from the management. He is no longer interested in reinstatement by the management and therefore does not want to pursue this reference. The reference may be filed ?"

In view of the settlement and the statement of the representative of the workman I answer the award that the termination of services of Shri Lutai was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated the 23rd June, 1979

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak

Endorsement No. 1528, dated 26th June, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

BABU RAM GOYAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.